

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/780,221

### REMARKS

Examiner Dexter has rejected the originally filed claims 1-5, 12-17, 21 and 22 of the present application. For the reasons which follow, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of the Examiner. The applicant does, however, wish to extend appreciation to Examiner Dexter for the quite detailed review of the claims of the present invention leading to the finding of patentable subject matter of the originally filed claims of the present application and an indication of the allowability of claims 6-11 and 18-20 if rewritten.

The drawings, disclosure and claims have been amended in a manner believed desired by the Examiner to overcome the objections and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 thereto. In this regard, claim 12 has been amended to eliminate "including" and to recite the components as cooperating with each other. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner concedes that Wedemeyer does not teach or suggest adjustable holding the kerf insert portion in a table insert. It is then respectfully requested that Examiner Dexter indicate where Ocenasek teaches or suggests adjustable holding and in particular how do lugs 16, washers 20, and wing nuts 19 disclosed therein meet the structural recitations of the claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that since both Wedemeyer and Ocenasek lack the structure recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom based thereon has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Likewise, it is then respectfully requested that Examiner Dexter indicate where Nadeau and/or Dils teach or suggest adjustable holding and, in particular, how screws 40 of Nadeau and/or screws 28 of Dils meet the structural recitations of the claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that since Wedemeyer and both of Nadeau and Dills lack the structure recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom based thereon has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has cited the United States patents listed in NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED as B, C and E and indicated consideration of the United States patents and publications cited by applicant. By the lack of application of these references and others like them within the classes or subclasses searched, the Examiner apparently recognizes the clear patentability of the present invention over any of these references.

Therefore, since the claims of the present application have been shown to include limitations directed to the features of applicant's zero-clearance table saw insert which are


## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/780,221

neither shown, described, taught, nor alluded to in any of the references cited by the Examiner and by the applicant, whether those references are taken singly or in any combination, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 1-20, as amended, of the present application and to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Stoffel



Dated: September 7, 2006.

Alan D. Kamrath, Reg. No. 28,227  
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.  
Attorneys for Applicant  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 820  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Tel: (612) 392-7306  
Fax: (612) 349-6556